Babylon University

Entailment and Presupposition

Areej As'ad Ja'far

College of Education

Department of English

1. Introduction

When one reads or hears pieces of language, one normally tries to understand not only what the words mean, but what the writer or the speaker of those words intend to convey. One of the principal difficulties that one faces when dealing with aspects of language is how to distinguish between entailment and presupposition. These two concepts are described and examined for the reason that they seem to provide the basis for answering a number of questions both about speaker-commitment and sentence meaning. As a matter of fact, presupposition is what the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance whereas entailment is what logically follows from what is asserted in the utterance.

The study deals with the notion of entailment, its types, i.e., background and foreground, as well as the relation between entailment and hyponymy. On the other hand, the research tackles the concept of presupposition showing its nature, properties, the difference between this notion and some concepts like synonymy and supposition, in addition to demonstrating the six kinds of presupposition. More specifically, this study attempts to reveal the relation between entailment and presupposition.

This study aims at:

1. Assessing Iraqi EFL university students' achievement in recognizing entailment and presupposition.
2. Identifying the points of difficulty which Iraqi EFL university student encounter in using entailment and presupposition.
3. Finding out the reasons beyond students' errors and the suitable solutions posited to deal with such errors.

In view of the preceding aims, it can be hypothesized that:

1. Most Iraqi EFL university students are unable to differentiate between entailment and presupposition.
2. The performance of both of the groups of students that have undertaken the first test is close.
3. The achievement of the experimental group that had been given lessons in this topic is anticipated to be better than that of the control group in the second try.

The researcher adopts the following steps in order to achieve the objectives of this study.

1. Producing, as far as possible, a comprehensive exposition of entailment and presupposition depending on the literature available in this field.
2. A test has been submitted to Iraqi EFL university students in order to pinpoint the problems and difficulties that they may face in using entailment and presupposition.
3. Analyzing the results of the test, on the bases of which conclusions have been presented.

This study is limited to third year students, Department of English, College of Education, University of Babylon during the academic year (2007-2008). The third year students have been selected because they have been taught this topic during a course given to them.

2. Entailment

Entailment is a term derived from formal logic and now often used as part of the study of semantics. All the other essential semantic relations like equivalence and contradiction can be defined in terms of entailment.

Crystal (1998: 136) defines it as "a term refers to a relation between a pair of sentences such that the truth of the second sentence necessarily follows from the truth of the first, e.g. *I can see a dog* entails

'I can see an animal'. One can not both assert the first and deny the second".

Lyons (1977: 85) points out that entailment is "a relation that holds between P and Q where P and Q are variables standing for propositions such that if the truth of Q necessarily follows from the truth of P (and the falsity of Q necessarily follows from the falsity of P), then P entails Q". Thus, Lyons treats entailment from a logical point of view. For instance, the sentence *John is a bachelor* entails three other sentences as follows:

1.a. John is unmarried.

b. John is male.

c. John is adult.

The relations between such words as *bachelor* and *unmarried, male, adult* can be handled in truth-conditional terms (Kempson, 1977: 38). The truth conditions in *John is a bachelor* are included in the conditions for *John is unmarried, John is male* and *John is adult*. It should be clear from this example that entailment here is not being used in the sense of material implication, which does not necessarily correspond exactly to the use of anything found in natural language, it is valid because of the truth functions assigned to it. We have here strict implication which involves truth in all possible worlds. Hence, to say that *John is a bachelor* entails 'John is unmarried' is to say that in all possible worlds, if the first is true, the second is true (Palmer, 1988: 203).

According to Yule (2000: 33), there are two types of entailment: **background entailment** and **foreground entailment**. In the example:

2. Bob chased three rabbits.

The speaker is necessarily committed to the truth of a very large number of background entailments, only some of them are presented as follows:

3.a. Someone chased three rabbits

b. Bob did something to three rabbits

c. Bob chased three of something

d. Something happened

On any occasion of utterance (2), the speaker will indicate how these entailments are to be ordered, i.e., the speaker will communicate which entailment is assumed to be more important for interpreting intended meaning, than any others. For instance, in uttering sentence (4a) below, the speaker indicates that the foreground entailment is that Bob chased a certain number of rabbits:-

4. a. Bob chased THREE rabbits.

b. BOB chased three rabbits.

In (b), the focus shifts to Bob, and the main assumption is that 'someone chased rabbits'.

Hence, there is a simple pragmatic rule to bear: the background entailments of a sentence are assumed to be not relevant in the context, what is assumed to be relevant, and thus the "point" of saying the sentence, is whatever information has to be added to the background to obtain the foreground, i.e., 'Bob chased three rabbits' (Levinson, 1997: 219). Consider another example:

5.a. John is married to Sarah

b. John is married to Sarah (foreground entailment)

c. John is married to someone (background entailment)

d. John has some property.

The first utterance with heavy stress on Sarah determines the focal scale or chain of entailments. This scale is obtained by substituting existentially

quantified variables or someone for constituents in the sentences, starting with the focus constituent, here Sarah.

The entailments that were looked at so far are lexical in origin, that is, they are derived from the lexical relationship between individual words. But entailment can also be syntactic in origin. Active and passive versions of the same sentence will entail one another (Finch, 2000: 164), for example:

6.a. John killed Bill.

b. Bill was killed by John.

These sentences mutually entail each other.

Kempson (1977: 80) states that "a relation of entailment arises between two assertions whenever an argument or predicate in one assertion is hyponymous to an argument or predicate in the other". Thus, there is a precise correspondence between entailment and hyponymy. "If two assertions differ only in the substitution of a hyponym for a superordinate term, then one of the assertions entails the other" (Allan, 1986: I 181)

Thus, hyponymy involves entailment. For instance, the utterance *This is a tulip* entails *This is a Flower* and *This is scarlet* entails *This is red.* This is true since hyponymy is the relationship between specific and general lexical items so that the former is included in the latter (Zuber, 2002: 2).

Another example is the following pair of sentences:

7.a. Jack killed Ann.

b. Ann died.

The entailment here is a consequence of the semantic relationship between 'kill' and 'die'. Since one of the possible ways in which one dies can be through being killed (Lyons, 1977: 180).

Crouch (2003: 11) states a special type of entailment called the metaphorical entailment which is " the imparting of a characteristic of the source domain (the metaphorical image) to the target domain (the concept receiving metaphorical treatment) by logical means".

Here are some examples of metaphorical entailment (Zuber, 2000: 4):-

8.a. He strayed from the line of argument.

b. Do you follow my argument?

c. I'm lost.

d. You're going around in circles.

As a matter of fact, there are some semantic relations that can be defined in terms of entailment, one of which is **contradiction** "If a sentence is said to entail the negation of the other then they are said to be contradictories" (Smith and Wilson, 1980: 152), for instance:

9.a. No one has led a perfect life.

b. Someone has led a prefect life.

Whenever (9a) is true, (9b) must be false, and whenever (9b) is true, (9a) must be false.

Another semantic relation is paraphrase. It is, according to Hurford and Heasley (1996: 112), a special symmetric case of entailment, both of which are sense relations between sentences and they are systematically connected with such sense properties of sentences as analyticity and contradiction.

Hence, the basis of semantic description is the notion of entailment. Many problems of semantics can be solved by assuming that the meaning of a sentence is a structured, partially ordered, set of entailments, with the structure being determined by a combination of syntactic, lexical, phonological and logical considerations.

3. Presupposition

Presupposition plays an important role in the production and comprehension of speech act. It is defined from different points of view, each of which is similar to each other in some way or another. Hudson (2000: 321) states that "a presupposition" is something assumed (presupposed) to be true in a sentence which asserts other information".

In the following example, sentence (a) presupposes sentence (b).

1. a. The child sneezed again.
   b. The child had sneezed before.

The first sentence presupposes the information in the second, and this is apparent in the fact that if the first sentence is negated, the truth of the second remains unchanged:

1. c. The child did not sneeze again.

Thus, the negation of the sentence can be considered as one of the tests used to check for the presupposition underlying the sentence, as in:

2. a. Mary's hat is red.
   b. Mary's hat is not red.

Although these two sentences have opposite meanings, the underlying presupposition, 'Mary has a hat', remains true (the same). This case is called by linguists as "constancy under negation", which is one of the properties used in pragmatics for testing presuppositions.

On the other hand, Levinson (1997:186) states that one of the properties of the presupposition is that they are liable to evaporate in certain context, either immediate linguistic context or the less immediate discourse context, or in circumstances where contrary assumptions are made. A simple example of this case can be provided by adding a clause or phrase to a sentence that is previously made:

3. a. John regreted having failed the exam.
   b. John did not regret having failed the exam.

Both of these sentences rest on the presupposition that John had failed in his exam, and there in fact has been an exam even if sentence (b) is negated. However, this is not going to be true when adding a clause to the second sentence like:

c. John did not regret having failed the exam, because in fact he passed.

This sentence does not rest on the same presupposition that both (a) and (b) rest on.

This case is called by pragmatists as **defeasibility** which is considered as a way for canceling the main presupposition underlying the sentence (ibid.).

Hudson (2000: 322) mentions that it is helpful to distinguish presupposition from **synonymy**. Presupposition, unlike synonymy, concerns knowledge which a speaker/writer does not assert but presumes as part of the background of a sentence, knowledge presumed to be already known to the hearer/reader. This explains why negating a

presupposing sentence (or making a negative presupposing sentence affirmative) dose not affect the truth of a presupposing, which remains as mere background, and why the falsity of a presupposing sentence unreasonable, or false. Synonymy, is also the relationship between paraphrases. For example:

4. a. Mary answered the question.
   b. Mary gave an answer to the question.

If one of the two sentences is true, so is the other and vice versa.

Yule (2000: 27) sees that presupposition has been associated with the use of a large number of words, phrases, and structures. These linguistic forms are considered to be indicators of potential presupposition, which can only become actual presupposition in context with speakers. Thus, he states six types of presupposition which are: **the existential, the factive, the non-factive, the lexical, the structural** and **the counterfactual.**

These six types of presupposition can be brought together under the heading of potential presupposition which represents the whole. The **existential** presupposition is assumed to be present either in possessive constructions (such as: *your car* presupposes (») *you have a car*) or in any definite noun phrase as in using expressions like: <u>the King of Sweden</u>, <u>the cat</u>, etc. in which the speaker presupposes the existence of the entities named (ibid.).

The second type of presupposition is called **factive** presupposition since some words are used in the sentences to denote facts, such as *know,*

realize, regret, glad, odd and *aware*. For example, *Everybody knows that John is ill* presupposes that John is ill.

The third type of presupposition is called **non-factive** presupposition, which is assumed not to be true. Verbs like *dream, imagine* and *pretend* are used with the presupposition that what follows is not true. e.g. *John dreamed that he was rich* presupposes that John was not rich. Moreover, Palmer (1988: 67) uses the word *likely* to refer to non-factive presupposition, as in *It is likely that John came early*, which presupposes that John might or might not come early.

There are forms which may be treated as the source of **lexical** presupposition, such as *manage, stop,* and *start*. In this type, the use of one form with its asserted meaning is conventionally interpreted with the presupposition that another (non-asserted) meaning is understood. When one says that *someone managed to do something*, the asserted meaning is that the person succeeded in some way. But when one says that *someone did not manage*, the asserted meaning is that the person did not succeed. In both cases. However, there is a presupposition (non-asserted) that the person tried to do that something. So, *managed* is conventionally interpreted as asserting 'succeeded' and presupposing 'tried' (ibid.).

In addition to the presuppositions that are associated with the use of certain words and phrases, there are also **structural** presuppositions. In this case, certain sentence structures have been analyzed as conventionally and regularly presupposing that part of the structure is assumed to be true (Yule,2000: 29). One might say that speakers can use such structures to treat information as presupposed (assumed to be true) and hence to be accepted as true by the listeners. For instance, the wh-

forms (i.e. when, where, etc.) can be used in this type, as in *When did John leave?* presupposes that John left. Acadian et al. (1997: 384) state that "the pragmatic presupposition of a sentence is the set of conditions that have to be satisfied in order for the intended speech act to be appropriate in the circumstances, or to be felicitous".

The last type is called a **counter-factual** presupposition, in which what is presupposed is not only true, but is the opposite of what is true, or contrary to facts. For example, the sentence: *If you were his friend you would have helped him* presupposes that you are not his friend. A conditional structure of this sentence presupposes that the information in the if-clause is not true of the time of utterance (ibid.).

Particularly associated with mediaeval philosophical grammar, the term **supposition** contrasts with presupposition. In semantics, it is an aspect of meaning which encompasses the actual situation in which an expression is used (Hartmann and Stork, 1976: 226). It is a message expressing an opinion or belief based on incomplete evidence about something, the expression of a belief that is held with confidence but not substantiated by positive knowledge or proof (Allen, 1986: II 194). Thus, it is a matter of semantics not pragmatics, since it depends on the words expressed (used) explicitly in the utterance whereas presupposition depends on the knowledge shared by both the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader and on the recognition of what is meant even when it is not said (or written). It depends on the words expressed implicitly in the utterance which is a matter of pragmatics. Supposition is related to speech whereas presupposition is concerned with communication. It is important to say that there is more than one presupposition in any sentence. These presuppositions are not directly stated in the sentence, but they are

inferred by the hearer/reader from it (ibid.). For instance, sentence (6) presupposes all sentences in (7).

6. John's wife works for Al-Tahrir Company.

7. a. A person named John exists.
   b. Both the speaker and the hearer know John.
   c. John is an adult male.
   d. John is married.
   e. John's wife is alive.
   f. There is a company named Al-Tahrir.
   g. Al-Tahrir company has employees.

The knowledge of the world that enables the speakers and the listeners to communicate the meanings (presuppositions) of (6), through the utterance of (7) is a part of language use. This property of the language (speech) can be called as "the expansion of the language use" or the "open-endedness property" (Levinson, 1997: 186).

Palmer (1988: 166-7) declares that in using expressions like *The king of France* (referring expressions) the speaker assumes that the hearer can identify the person or the thing being spoken about. He does not therefore assert that the person or thing exists but merely presupposes his or its existence. If the person or thing does not exist, there is presupposition failure and the sentence is not false but it is neither true nor false, thus, there is a 'truth-value gap'. For example, *The King of France is bald* states this case because in this present time there is no king in France.

One can conclude that presuppositions are considered to be a matter of pragmatics not of semantics because they are not stable and context-independent aspects of meaning as it is shown in the case of defeasibility.

4.The Difference

The postulation that there is no border line between presupposition and entailment is not valid due to the fact that there are some differences between them.

In the sentences

1.a. I bought a cat.

b. I bought an animal.

Negating (1a) means that (1b) can be either true or false. In other words, the entailment fails. Therefore, for example saying that *I didn't buy a cat* leaves completely open the question of whether or not I bought an animal. Nevertheless, this would not be so if the relationship was one of presupposition (Finch, 2000: 162). In the sentences below, (2a) presupposes (assumes) the truth of (2b):-

2.a. The King of England left for Peru yesterday.

b.There is a King of England.

But even if (2a) is negated, the presupposition holds:-

c. The King of England did not leave for Peru yesterday.

d. There is a King of England.

Consider the following case (Sa'eed, 1997: 95):

3.a. I saw my father today.

b. I saw someone today.

c. I did not see my father today.

Here, (3a) entails (3b), but if (3a) is negated to form (3c), it no longer entails (3b). But with a presupposition pair, the case is different. Look at the following example:

4.a. The mayor of Liverpool is in town.

b. There is a mayor of Liverpool.

When (4a) is negated, presupposition survives as shown in:

c. The mayor of Liverpool is not in town.

d. There is a mayor of Liverpool.

Thus, denying the presupposing sentence does not affect the presupposition whereas negating the entailing sentence destroys the entailment (ibid.).

In fact, there is another difference between entailment and presupposition illustrated by both Levinson (1997: 219) and Leech (1976: 292). While entailment is a relation restricted to assertions, presupposition can involve other types of predication as well. The following example illustrates this difference:

5.a. The book you took from the teacher is interesting. (assertion)

b. When did you take the book from the teacher? (question)

c. See that you take back the book you took from the teacher. (command)

d. What an interesting book you took from the teacher! (exclamation)

All these sentences carry the presupposition you took a book from the teacher.

Leech (1976: 294) illustrates that what both entailment and presupposition have in common is that they satisfy the criterion of uncontradictability. That is to say, if one joins X with the negation of its presupposition or entailment Y, then, the result is going to be an absurdity:

6.a. He didn't marry (a girl), but the girl he married was a blonde.

b. He didn't marry (a girl), but was the girl he married a blonde?

c. He didn't marry a blonde, but he married a blonde heiress.

All of these sentences are bizarre, but not all for the same reason, i.e., the first two sentences result from the contradiction of a presupposition while the third from the condition of an entailment (ibid.).

In short, the so-called presuppositions are just background entailments. For instance the sentence *It is Sarah that John is married to* has the same structure of entailments as the utterance *John is married to Sarah.* Actually, the semantic structure is determined by the grammatical structure, here, by the cleft construction rather than by heavy stress. Thus, the alleged presupposition of clefts is simply the first background entailment, hence the statement indicates that *John is married to someone.*

3. Data Collection

A diagnostic test has been designed in order to reveal the difficulties encountered by Iraqi EFL university students in manipulating entailment and presupposition and to identify the causes behind such errors.

Two groups of students that have studied the topic of entailment and presupposition indirectly in semantics had undergone the test. After giving a course of fifteen lectures to the second group, i.e., the experimental group, the two groups had been tested again.

The test includes twenty items; each item consists of two sentences in which the second sentence is either the entailment or the presupposition of the preceding one. The learners are asked to inform whether the second sentence in each item is the entailment or presupposition of the first sentence.

Some items of the test have been taken from ***Semantics*** by Geoffrey Leech (1976) and ***Semantics*** by F. R. Palmer (1988).

4. Data Analysis

This section deals with the analysis and discussion of the results of the test. The errors that are committed by Iraqi EFL learners in using entailment and presupposition have been identified and shown statistically. In addition, endeavours have been made to point out the plausible sources of these errors so as to get some insights into the nature of the difficulties that Iraqi EFL university students have encountered in this area.

The results of group (A), i.e., the control group, in the first attempt at each item of the test in particular and at the entire test in general are given below:

Table (1)

Group (A) Achievement of the Question in the First Attempt

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1	9	20	36	80
2	21	46.67	24	53.33
3	11	24.44	34	75.56
4	14	31.11	31	68.89
5	13	28.89	32	71.11
6	12	26.67	33	73.33
7	12	26.67	33	73.33
8	7	15.55	38	64.46
9	13	28.89	32	71.11

10	3	6.67	42	93.33
11	9	20	36	80
12	16	35.56	29	64.44
13	1	2.22	44	97.78
14	7	15.55	38	84.46
15	16	35.56	29	64.44
16	10	22.22	35	77.78
17	1	2.22	44	97.78
18	14	31.11	31	68.89
19	1	2.22	44	97.78
20	16	35.56	29	64.44
Total	206	22.89	694	77.11

The results denote that the total number of the correct responses (206, 22.89%) is much lower than that of the incorrect ones (694, 77.11%).

Table (2) displays the responses of group (B), the experimental group, to the items of the question in the first attempt:

Table (2)

Group (B) Achievement of the Question in the First Attempt

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1	5	11.11	40	88.89
2	21	46.67	24	53.33
3	11	24.44	34	75.56
4	12	26.67	33	73.33

5	11	24.44	34	75.56
6	12	26.67	33	73.33
7	19	42.22	26	57.78
8	4	8.89	41	91.11
9	16	35.56	29	64.44
10	5	11.11	40	88.89
11	7	15.56	38	84.44
12	17	37.78	28	62.22
13	2	4.44	43	95.56
14	4	8.89	41	91.11
15	16	35.56	29	64.44
16	6	13.33	39	86.67
17	5	11.11	40	88.89
18	13	28.89	32	71.11
19	6	13.33	39	86.67
20	18	40	27	60
Total	210	23.33	690	76.67

It is clear that most of the subjects failed to give the correct answers. Thus, the total number of their correct responses is (210, 23.33%), whereas that of their incorrect ones is (690, 76.67%).

Thus, the subjects' achievement in the first attempt affirms the first hypothesis that reads: most Iraqi EFL university students are unable to differentiate between entailment and presupposition.

In addition, the second hypothesis that reads: The performance of both of the groups in the first test is close, is asserted.

The following two tables demonstrate the responses of group (A) and (B) to the items of the question in the second attempt:

Table (3)

Group (A) Achievement of the Question in the Second Attempt

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1	7	15.56	38	84.44
2	21	46.67	24	53.33
3	10	22.22	35	77.78
4	11	24.44	34	75.56
5	15	33.33	30	66.67
6	12	26.67	33	73.33
7	11	24.44	34	75.56
8	5	11.11	40	88.89
9	14	31.11	31	68.89
10	5	11.11	40	88.89
11	9	20	36	80
12	14	31.11	31	68.89
13	1	2.22	44	97.78
14	3	6.67	42	93.33
15	17	37.78	28	62.22
16	10	22.22	35	77.78
17	1	2.22	44	97.78
18	13	28.89	32	71.11
19	2	4.44	43	95.56
20	15	33.33	30	66.67
Total	196	21.78	704	78.22

Table (4)

Group (A) Achievement of the Question in the Second Attempt

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1	19	42.22	26	57.78
2	39	86.67	6	13.33
3	28	62.22	17	37.78
4	35	77.78	10	22.22
5	23	51.11	22	48.89
6	24	53.33	21	46.67
7	32	71.11	13	28.89
8	18	40	27	60
9	28	62.22	17	37.78
10	23	51.11	22	48.89
11	29	64.44	16	35.56
12	28	62.22	17	37.78
13	21	46.67	24	53.33
14	22	48.89	23	51.11
15	39	86.67	6	13.33
16	23	51.11	22	48.89
17	21	46.67	24	53.33
18	31	68.89	14	31.11
19	23	51.11	22	48.89
20	38	84.44	7	15.56
Total	544	60.44	356	39.56

Again, most of the subjects in Group (A) failed to give the right answers due to the fact that the total number of their correct responses is (196, 21.78%), whereas that of their incorrect ones is (704, 78.22%). Unlike Group (A), students in Group (B) were able to pass and there is a drastic change in their responses in the second try. The total number of their right answers is (544, 60.44%), while that of their wrong ones is (356, 39.56%). As such, the premise: The achievement of the group that had been given lessons in this topic is anticipated to be better than that of the other group in the second try, is proved.

The following table illustrates the students' outcomes in both of the tries:

Table (5)

Subjects' Results in both of the Attempts

	No. of Correct Responses		%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1st Attempt	A	206	22.89	694	77.11
	B	210	23.33	690	76.67
	Total	416	23.12	1384	76.88
2nd Attempt	A	196	21.78	704	78.22
	B	544	60.44	356	39.56

The marks of each student (out of twenty) in both of the attempts are as follows:

Table (6)

Group A's Marks of the Question in both of the Attempts

Student's no.	**1st Mark**	**2nd Mark**	**Student's no.**	**1st Mark**	**2nd Mark**	**Student's no.**	**1st Mark**	**2nd Mark**	**Student's no.**	**1st Mark**	**2nd Mark**
1	9	11	13	8	6	25	3	1	37	3	2

2	10	11	14	6	8	26	4	5	38	2	0
3	9	10	15	8	4	27	0	0	39	3	3
4	7	8	16	7	7	28	0	0	40	5	4
5	6	7	17	6	6	29	0	0	41	6	5
6	6	7	18	7	6	30	0	0	42	3	4
7	7	7	19	5	4	31	1	1	43	4	3
8	7	8	20	6	5	32	1	0	44	6	2
9	6	6	21	1	3	33	0	0	45	6	5
10	5	6	22	3	4	34	2	2			
11	6	5	23	4	3	35	3	4			
12	8	8	24	3	2	36	4	3			

Table (7)

Group B's Marks of the Question in both of the Attempts

Student's no.	**1st Mark**	**2nd Mark**	**Student's no.**	**1st Mark**	**2nd Mark**	**Student's no.**	**1st Mark**	**2nd Mark**	**Student's no.**	**1st Mark**	**2nd Mark**
1	7	16	13	7	10	25	6	14	37	4	13
2	10	12	14	4	10	26	6	13	38	4	12
3	10	11	15	4	14	27	3	10	39	4	12
4	10	13	16	4	13	28	5	12	40	6	11
5	6	11	17	6	13	29	6	12	41	4	11
6	7	17	18	0	10	30	4	8	42	4	10
7	7	15	19	2	14	31	4	16	43	0	10
8	7	16	20	5	10	32	4	11	44	0	9
9	7	14	21	2	11	33	0	11	45	0	10
10	6	16	22	6	12	34	3	11			

11	10	13	23	5	14	35	1	12			
12	2	8	24	2	10	36	6	13			

It is obvious from Table (6) that the marks of Group A's students in both of the attempts are approximately the same while, according to Table (6), the situation is different with Group (B): there is a huge dissimilarity between their results in the first and the second attempt. For example, student number (7) takes only seven in the first attempt while his mark becomes seventeen in the second try. In addition, most of the subjects who pass in the first try succeed in the second one. Some instances are student no. 19, 31, 43, and 45. This emphasizes the importance of teaching this topic to EFL learners.

5. Sources of Errors

This section deals with the identification of errors and the reasons beyond committing certain types of errors as far as these errors are related to the learners' wrong use of entailment and presupposition.

In this study, most errors are attributed to intralingual transfer, context of learning, and communication strategies.

5.1 Intralingual Transfer: It is another sort of error that is manifested in students' writing due to faulty or partial learning of the target language and this is the negative element of intralingual transfer or overgeneralization. Such errors may be the result of the influence of one target language item upon another (Penny, 2001: 8-9).

Overgeneralization, ignorance of the rule restriction, incomplete application of the rules, and false concepts hypothesized may be attributed to intralingual errors.

Overgeneralization error, "this type of error is the result of trying to use a rule in a context where it does not belong to, for example, putting

a regular *-ed* ending on an irregular verb, as in 'buyed' instead of 'bought'" (Lightbown and Spada, 2003: 178).

Ignorance of rule restriction i.e. "applying rules to contexts to which they do not apply" (Richards and Sampson, 1974: 70).

Incomplete application of the rules involves the avoidance of the learner to use more complex sorts of structure or forms because the learner believes that he can communicate effectively by using relatively simple rules or forms, and **false concepts hypothesized** that may be derived from wrong comprehension of a distinction in the target language (Brown, 1987: 81-3 and Chanier et al., 1992: 134).

Concerning overgeneralization, most of the students thought that the second sentence in item (8) is the presupposition of the preceding one while it is its entailment. As far as incomplete application of the rules is concerned, the reason beyond the subjects' choice of either presupposition or entailment instead of both in items 13, 14, 17, and 19 is this factor. Furthermore, most of the errors committed by the students in the first item may be ascribed to false concepts hypothesized.

The total number of errors that are possibly due to the intralingual transfer is (13.31%).

5.2 Context of Learning: This is the most popular source of the subjects' errors. These errors arise from the ignorance of the importance of the topic of entailment and presupposition. These two concepts are not tackled extensively in the students' textbooks. This encourages EFL learners to make faulty hypotheses about the language.

The total number of errors that are possibly due to using such strategies is (61.52%) of the total number of the subjects' errors.

5.3 Communication Strategies: When the EFL learners try to communicate, they may encounter difficulty because their foreign

language is not well developed. In this respect, the learner may anticipate such a problem and modify what he intends to say. If he is engaged in speech, he must try to find an alternative way of getting the meaning across. His way of facing the situation is called communication strategy (Littlewood, 1984: 83-4).

In this section, some of the communication strategies which the learners have been observed to use are given.

Avoidance in which the learner tries to avoid the item which will present difficulty because he has no information to solve it (ibid.). This strategy has been used by the subjects in items (13) and (17).

Guessing when the learners are in doubt about the correct answer they begin to guess (Brown, 2001: 309). This strategy has been used by the subjects in some of the items by choosing entailment and presupposition together.

The total number of errors that may be related to using such strategies is (25.17%) of the total number of the subjects' errors.

6. Conclusions

In the light of the students' responses, it can be concluded that:

1. Most Iraqi EFL university students are unable to differentiate between entailment and presupposition. The results denote that the total number of the correct responses of both of the groups in the first try is (416, 23.12%) and the incorrect ones is (1384, 76.88%). Thus, the first hypothesis is confirmed.
2. The results of Group (A) denote that the total number of the correct responses is (206, 22.89%) in the first attempt and that of Group (B) is (210, 23.33%). This confirms the second hypothesis: their results are close in the first attempt.

3. The achievement of the group that had been given lessons in this subject matter is better than that of the other group in the second try due to the fact that the total number of the proper answers of the subjects in Group (A) is (196, 21.78%) and that of their incorrect ones is (704, 78.22%) while the total number of the right answers of the subjects in Group (B) is (544, 60.44%) and the wrong ones is (356, 39.56%). This verifies the third hypothesis. The results stress the significance and effectiveness of teaching this subject to EFL learners.
4. There are three sorts of errors made by the sample of the present study. The errors can be summarized as follows:
   a- Wrong choice of entailment and presupposition.
   b- Choosing both of them.
   c- Giving no answer.
5. The subjects' errors have been attributed to the following factors:
   I. Intralingual transfer, whereby the subjects use their prior knowledge of the target language. This type of error constitutes (13.31%).
   II. Context of learning as no attention has been paid to entailment and presupposition in the textbooks. This type of error constitutes (61.52%).
   III. Communication strategies which are selected by the subjects to fill the gap of their knowledge. This type of error constitutes (25.17%).

References:

Acadian, A., Former, A., and Garnish, R.(1997). Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication. London: Mit Press.

Allan, K. (1986). Linguistic Meaning. Vol.I. London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul.

Brown, H. D. (1987). ***Principles of Language Learning and Teaching***. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc.

________ (2001). ***Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy***. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Longman, Inc.

Chanier, T.; Pengelly, M.; and Self, J. (1992). "Conceptual Modelling in Error Analysis in Computer-Assisted Language Learning System". http://www.kkhec.ac.ir/Linguistics20%articles%20index%Conceptual%Modelling%20%in%20Error%20Analysis.htm

Crouch, R. (2003). Scalability of Redundancy Detection in Focused Document Collections. Heidelberg, Germany: Cascadilla Press.

Crystal, D. (1998). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.

Finch, G. (2000). Linguistic Terms and Concepts. London: Macmillan Press LTD.

Hartmann, R. and Stork, F.C. (1976). Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. London: Applied Science Publishers.

Hudson, G. (2000). Essential Introductory Linguistics. Michigan: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Kempson, R. M. (1977). Semantic Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leech, G. N. (1976). Semantics. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Levinson, S. C. (1997). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, P. M. and Spada, N. (2003). ***How Languages are Learned***. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W. T. (1984). ***Foreign and Second Language Learning***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1977). New Horizons in Linguistics. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Palmer, F. R. (1988). Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Penny, W. K. (2001). "An Analysis of Student Error Patterns in Written English: Suggested Teaching Procedures to Help". www.cels.bham.acuk/resources/essays/penny2.pdf.

Richards, J.C. and Sampson, G.P. (1974). "The Study of Learner English". In Richards, J.C. (ed.) ***Error Analysis. Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition***. London: Longman.

Sa'eed, J. (1997). Semantics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Smith, N. V. and Wilson, D. (1980). Modem Linguistics: the Results of Chomsky's Revolution. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books Ltd.

Yule, G. (2000). Pragmatics. London: Oxford University Press.

Zuber, R. (2000). Metaphorical Entailment. Cascadilla: Cascadilla Press.

________ (2002). Intercategorial Entailment. Cascadilla: Cornell University Press.

Appendix 1

Q. /Respond to the following sentences showing whether each one is followed by its entailment, presupposition, or both:

1. I regret leaving London.
   I left London.
2. John is a bachelor.
   John is unmarried.
3. Mary's brother bought three horses.
   Mary has only one brother.
4. Sue and Fred went to the party.
   Sue went to the party.
5. The King of France is bald.
   There is a King of France.
6. Have you stopped beating your wife?
   You have beaten her in the past.
7. Linda did not see the horse with two heads.
   Linda did not see anything.
8. What Bill lost wasn't his wallet.
   Bill lost something.
9. Ann's brother has just got back from Nigeria.
   The listener knows Ann.
10. He has stopped turning into a werewolf every full moon.
    He used to turn into a werewolf every full moon.
11. The President was assassinated.
    The President is dead.
12. Daniel is looking for the Dean.
    Daniel is looking for someone.
13. Kepler died in misery.
    There is some individual named Kepler.
14. Sam broke the window.
    The window broke.
15. This paint is scarlet.
    This paint is red.
16. Even Candy could solve that problem.
    Candy is the last person you'd expect to solve the problem.
17. Debra's cat is cute.
    Debra has a cat.
18. He married a blonde heiress.
    He married a blonde.
19. George began planting tomatoes.
    George had not been planting tomatoes before.
20. I can see a dog.
    I can see an animal.